

2

5

A SHORT
Catechism

By way of
Question and Answer:

THE
ANSWERS

Of which are taken from the
Express Words
OF
SCRIPTURE:

With some plain *Infe-*
rences arising from
the said *Texts* concern-
ing *Succession* and the
Blessed Sacrament.

Printed in the Year, 1686.

C

Qu

to

it i

Go

are

4.

by

[I]



A SHORT

Catechism.

Qu. **I**s it possible for Infidels, or those without Faith, to be Sav'd?

Ans. Without Faith it is impossible to please God, *Heb. 11. 6.*

Qu. How many Faiths are there?

Ans. One Faith, *Ephes.*

A. 5.

Qu. How do we come by Faith?

A 2

A.

[2]

Ans. Faith comes by
Hearing, Rom. 10. 17.

Qu. How shall we
Hear without a Preacher?
Rom. 10. 14.

Ans. Hear the Church,
S. Matth. 18. 17.

Qu. Where shall I find
which is the Church?

Ans. Thou art Peter,
and upon this Rock, will
I Build my Church, and
the Gates of Hell shall
not prevail against it.
St. Matth. 16. 18.

Inference, That Church
then, and no other,
which derives its Bishops
in a Line of Succession
down from St. Peter

is the Church that I am
bid *To Hear*.

But no other Church
besides the Church of
Rome, so much as pre-
tends to derive a visible
Succession of *Bishops*
down from *St. Peter*.

Therefore the Church
of *Rome*, and no other,
is *That Church*, which I
am bid *to hear*.

Object. *But how know*
We, that this Promise
is not made to the Words
of the fore-going Confes-
sion that St. Peter made,
rather than to the Person
that spoke those words, as
Protestants, to take off the

A 3 force

Ans. Faith comes by
Hearing, Rom. 10. 17.

Qu. How shall we
Hear without a Preacher?
Rom. 10. 14.

Ans. Hear the Church,
S. Matth. 18. 17.

Qu. Where shall I find
which is the Church?

Ans. Thou art Peter,
and upon this Rock, will
I Build my Church, and
the Gates of Hell shall
not prevail against it,
St. Matth. 16. 18.

Inference, That Church
then, and no other,
which derives its Bishops
in a Line of Succession
down from St. Peter,

is

is the Church that I am
bid *To Hear*.

But no other Church
besides the Church of
Rome, so much as pre-
tends to derive a visible
Succession of *Bishops*
down from *St. Peter*.

Therefore the Church
of *Rome*, and no other,
is *That Church*, which I
am bid *to hear*.

Object. *But how know*
We, that this Promise
is not made to the Words
of the fore-going Confes-
sion that St. Peter made,
rather than to the Person
that spoke those words, as
Protestants, to take off the

A 3 force

*force of this place, use to
Answer for themselves.*

Sol. Because the *same
Confession* in the *self-
same Words*, that we
find here in the Mouth
of *St. Peter*, we find
in the Mouth even of
the *Devils themselves*,
as *St. Luke* testifies 4.41.
And the *Devils* also
came out of many, cry-
ing, and saying, *Thou art
CHRIST the Son of God*,
So that if the *Promise*
respected only the *Con-
fession*, in-as-much as the
Devils in *St. Luke* made
the *same Confession*, as
St. Peter in *St. Matthew's*
Go-

Gospel ; it follows, then that the Promise was as much made to the *Devils Confession*, as to St. *Peter's*. But this being an Impiety to affirm, as well as an ill consequence, that tends to Build the Church as much upon the *Devils*, as upon St. *Peter*. And there being no way imaginable to avoid this Absurdity, but to make a *Difference* between the *Persons* of the *Apostle*, and of the *Devils*, who both made the *same Confession*. It remains of necessity, that the *Promise*

regards the *Person* of *St. Peter*, and not his *Doctrine* alone. And that by consequence we can never be assur'd of the *Doctrinal Succession* without the *Personal*, nor of the Means of having *St. Peter's Doctrine* delivered down to us, without *Hearing St. Peter's Bishops* that sit in *St. Peter's Chair*.

Object. *But put the Case, St. Peters Bishops, or the Popes tell me one one thing, and my Senses tell me another, as in the matter of the Sacrament; where His Bishops tell me*

me it is the Body of CHRIST after Consecration ; though My Senses tell me plainly, that there is nothing but a Wafer ; does Scripture oblige me where the Authority of the Church, and the Testimony of my Senses interfere, to Hear the Church, even when, and where it contradicts My Senses ?

Ansiv. If the Sacrament be a point of Faith and not of Knowledge, and that Faith and Knowledge depend not upon the Testimony and Report of the same Senses,

regards the *Person* of *St. Peter*, and not his *Doctrine* alone. And that by consequence we can never be assur'd of the *Doctrinal Succession* without the *Personal*, nor of the Means of having *St. Peter's Doctrine* delivered down to us, without *Hearing St. Peter's Bishops* that sit in *St. Peter's Chair*.

Object. *But put the Case, St. Peters Bishops, or the Popes tell me one one thing, and my Senses tell me another, as in the matter of the Sacrament; where His Bishops tell*
me

me it is the Body of CHRIST after Consecration ; though My Senses tell me plainly, that there is nothing but a Wafer ; does Scripture oblige me where the Authority of the Church, and the Testimony of my Senses interfere, to Hear the Church, even when, and where it contradicts My Senses ?

Ans. If the Sacrament be a point of Faith and not of Knowledge, and that Faith and Knowledge depend not upon the Testimony and Report of the same Senses,

ses, the Resolution of this Enquiry will put us upon finding out which of the *Senses* is proper to *Faith*, and which of them again to *Knowledge*, since they both enter at *several Doors*, and that *Door* which *opens* to *Faith*, *shuts out Knowledge*, as on the contrary, all the *Doors* again that open to *Knowledge*, as duely *shut out Faith*.

To find out the *Door of Faith*, we must again have Recourse to the fore-cit d place from *St. Paul*. *Faith* comes by
Hear-

Hearing, Rom. 10. 17.
 And if it comes by *Hear-*
ing, then not by *Seeing*,
Smelling, *Tasting*, *Touch-*
ing. For though we
 have *Five Senses*, *Faith*
 it seems *Challenges* but
One of the *Number*,
 leaving the other *Four*
 to *Knowledge*. We have
 a double *Instance* of
 this *in Fact*. One of
 the *Competition* be-
 tween the *Eye* and the
Ear from the *New Testa-*
ment, and the other of
 the *Ear* and the *Touch*
 from the *Old Testament*.
 For our *Blessed Lord* ap-
 pearing after his *Resur-*
 A 6 *rection*

rection to St. Mary Magdalen in the shape of a Gardiner, S. John 20. 15, 16. She supposing him to have been the Gardiner, says unto him, Sir if thou hast born him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away. Where, while she us'd the Popular Argument of Sense, and believed her own Eyes, she denied her Saviour, for want of using the proper Sense of Faith; But it follows, JESUS says unto her, Mary, and then her Faith came by Hearing, and she Immediately

ately turn'd her self, and
 says unto him, Rabboni,
 which is to say, Master.
 The other Instance is in
 Genesis 27. 21, 22, 23.
 Where Dim Isaac says
 to Jacob (who was Drest
 in the Rough Cloaths of
 Esau,) Come near, I pray
 thee, that I may feel thee,
 my Son, whether thou be
 my very Son Esau, or not :
 And Jacob went near to
 Isaac his Father and he
 felt him, and said, the
 Voice is Jacob's Voice,
 but the Hands are the
 Hands of Esau. Where
 we find, that as his Ear
 and his Touch were in
 two

two Tales ; so what his *Hearing* told him, was true News ; but instead of crediting the Sense of *Faith*, he Erred, as our *Objectors* now do, by an Appeal to the *Touch* : For as it follows, *He discern'd him not because his Hands were Hairy, as his Brother Esau's Hands.* To proceed then to apply both these to the present Case. If *St. Mary Magdalens* Sight was deceiv'd, so that she could not distinguish between our Blessed *Lord* and a *Gardiner* ; if *Isaac's* Touch (which we make use

use of, as a certainer
 Sense, to correct the *Sight*
 in many Cases) was de-
 ceived, so that he could
 not distinguish *Jacob*
 from *Esaú*: What hin-
 ders, but that our *Sight*
 and our *Touch* may be in
 like manner deceived,
 in not distinguishing our
Lords Body from a *Wa-*
fer in the *Blessed Sacra-*
ment? Or why may not
 our *Lord* appear, if he
 pleases under the Form
 of a *Wafer*, as well as of
 a *Gardiner*; and lie hid
 under *other Cloaths* than
 his *Own*, as *Jacob* did in
Esaú's? For if their Sen-
 ses

ses were at a loss in a
 matter of *Fact*, where
 they were the proper
 Informers, much more
 may ours be at a loss in
 a matter of *Faith*, where
 they are not proper In-
 formers ; For in strict-
 ness, we only *Believe*
 where we do not *See*,
 and where once we *See*,
 we do not *Believe*, but
Know. As a *Magdalen*
 then blinded with Tears
 mistaking her Dear Lord
 for the cover of a *Gardi-
 ner*, proceeded to de-
 mand of him, where
 they *had laid him* ? So is
 it possible for a Weep-
 ing

ing *Penitent*, mistaking the *Inward Substance* for the outward cover of *Bread*, to enquire of the *Priest* where he has laid our *Lords Body*; Or as *Isaac* (grown dim with *Age*) took the *Cloaths* for *Esau*; so we that see through a *Glass darkly*, may mistake the *Disguise* of a *Wafer* for the thing that lies under. But then as the *Old Patriarch*, who felt nothing but *Esau*, while he list'ned to *Jacob's Voice*, acknowledged it was *He*; or as the *She-Disciple*, who saw nothing but a *Gardiner*,

diner , when once she heard him speak, ran to her Embraces, and cry'd out, *My God, and my Lord!* Even so we that can *see* and *feel* nothing but a *Wafer* in the Sacrament; when once we hear the Voice of Truth, (*This is my Body,*) run to our Adorations, and straight cry out, *My God, and my Lord,* acknowledging that that *Almighty Word*, which was able in the first *Creation* to make *All Things* out of *Nothing*, is much more able in the *Daily Consecration*, to make his *Own Body*

Body out of Any Thing.

I would gladly be inform'd of such as bound their *Faith* with their *Sight*, and will *Believe* no more then they *see*, If they had conversed with our *Blessed Lord* upon *Earth*, whether they would have believed his *Divine Nature*? Since, though the *Miracles* he wrought to prove it, were in *sight*; yet the *God* that wrought them all was *out of sight*. The like Question I would gladly put them as to their Belief of the *Deity* of the *Holy Ghost*,
un -

under the *Appearances* of a *Dove*, and of *Fiery Tongues*: Whether in the one *Case*, they were bound to believe a *God*, when they could *see* and *handle* nothing but a *Dove*; or a *God* in the other, when they could *see* and *feel* nothing else but *Tongues of Fire*? Since if they conclude aright that there is none of our *Lords Body* in the *Blessed Sacrament*, because they *see* and *feel* nothing but a *Wafer*; the self-same Argument will equally be turned against the *Deity*, both
of

of the *Son* and of the *Holy Ghost*, because they *saw* and *felt* nothing more then a *Man* in our *Saviour*; and so nothing more then a *Dove*, or *Tongues* of *Fire* in the two *Appearances* of the *Holy Ghost*. Or if they will say, that this Argument from their *Senses* is of no force in those two *Cases* against the *Deity* of the *Son*, and of the *Holy Ghost*; then must they be forced to admit, that the same Argument holds not against the truth of *Christs* Body in the *Blessed Sacrament*.

crament. For why is not a *Wafer* as like *God*, as a *Man*, or a *Dove*, or *Tongues* of *Fire*? If it be said, that there is no *Mark* of *Difference*, or outward *Distinction* between a *Consecrated Wafer*, and an *Un-consecrated* one; I demand what *Mark* of *Difference* or *Outward Distinction* there was between the *Holy Ghosts Dove*, and another *Dove*; or between the *Person* of our *Blessed Lord*, and that of *any other Man*? For if notwithstanding the want of an *Ear-mark*
the

the *Dove* which the *Holy-Ghost* assum'd, and the *Body* which our Blessed *Lord* animated, were not esteem'd a *common Dove*, or a *common Body*; what hinders, but that likewise (notwithstanding the same want,) the *Consecrated Wafer* should claim the same Privilege to pass for no *common Wafer*? For all the Arguments that lie against the one, may equally be turn'd against the other; and it is but just, where the *Objections* are all the same, that the *Answers* should be all

[22]

all the same too ; and
where the *Cases* are a-
like, should be either a-
like accepted, or refus'd.

F I N I S.

and
e a-
er a-
s'd.